Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/894,007	FOUGHT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John P Trimmings	2133
Il Participants: Status of Application: <u>Pending</u>		
(1) <u>John P Trimmings</u> .	(3)	
(2) Gregory D. Caldwell.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 2 December 2004	Time: <u>4:15 PM</u>	
Type of Interview:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: none		
Claims discussed: 31-48	•	
Prior art documents discussed:	,	
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.	·	
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
John P. Foring		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and applicant discussed new claims 31-48, and patentability of each of the three independent claims 31, 38 and 44. It was agreed that the claims are allowable based on the following:

As per Claims 32,33,34,35 and 37: The 1st line of each claim should begin with the recitation, "The method of Claim 31".

The applicant has canceled Claim 36.

The applicant has canceled Claim 47.

The applicant has amended Claim 31 beginning at line 10, deleting the recitation to the end of the claim. And, beginning at line 10, adding the following: "determining that the buffer circuit is operational by generating a pass signal in response to a difference between the delay of the strobe signal associated with the first signaland the delay of the strobe signal associated with the second signal being indicative of an improper strobe window."

The applicant has amended Claim 44 beginning at the last line 9, deleting the period at the end of the claim. And, beginning at line 9 after the last word of the claim, adding the following: "indicating a pass status in response to a difference between the delay of the strobe signal associated with at least one latched bit differing from its corresponding driven bit and the delay of the strobe signal associated with all latched bits differ from their corresponding driven bits being indicative of a proper strobe window."

It was also agreed that Claim 38 is allowable in its present form..